

**South Park Stakeholders Group – Board of Directors Meeting
Thursday, June 20, 2013, 8:30 AM
1333 S. Hope St, Los Angeles, CA 90015**

Board Members: Robin Bieker, Bob Buente, Phillip Hill, Gary Warfel, Shelby Jordan, Cliff Hoffman
ABSENT: David Galaviz

Staff: Jessica Lall, Amanda Irvine

Guests: Doyle McDonald (Hearst/1111 S Broadway), Robert Hooks (Lincoln Properties), Kris Morrish (Kitzer Co), Mercedes Talley (Flower Street Lofts), Shant Hovasapian (LA BSL), Ruben Flamenco (LA BSL), John Massond (TMA), Willie Nishizana (Melendrez), Greg Vance (Avant Apartments KWP), Kevin Farrell (Century West Apartments), Richard Wu (Grand Lofts), Victor Moller (101 Senior Housing Corp), Melissa Mills (Elleven Lofts), Sauli Danpour (XVYest Holidays Inc), Shannon Han (Marshall Projects/Hope St Hotel), Joanna Amador (Marshall Projects/Hope St Hotel), Sara Hernandez (Councilmember Huizar's Office, CD 14)

MINUTES:

Board Chair, Robin Bieker, called the meeting to order at 8:31 AM. There were no public announcements or comments.

Item	Discussion	Action taken?
Public Comment	<i>None</i>	<i>No action taken</i>
Review and approve May 2013 Minutes	Gary- P.2, on approving the bylaws: replace "Just look them over" with "Review and comment". P.3- \$30,000 for the truck- need to review this and double check it; will discuss amount and line item of budget with Jessica and RBZ.	Bob motions to approve the May 2013 minutes subject to aforementioned changes, Phillip seconds. All in favor, none opposed.
Presentation: Bureau of Street Lighting, Prop 218 assessment	Willie - Improvements for Figueroa and 11 th that BSL will address include area to from Figueroa to Broadway, and exist to enhance pedestrian safety, connectivity, and circulation as part of the greater My Figueroa project. These improvements include expanding sidewalk area, introducing	<i>No action taken</i>

	<p>landscape, seat-wall/seating element, areas to gather/hang out outside buildings- therefore, looking at lighting as well as landscaping. Because of the way street lighting works in particular, the addition of pedestrian level lighting triggers Prop 218: a review of the costs to light 11th St and how much property owners would have to pay. If this ballot of Prop 218 does not pass, the pedestrian lighting will NOT be installed, as the grant money for installation must be used within a certain timeframe. This money could go instead towards other projects within My Figueroa, not necessarily on 11th street.</p> <p>Ruben - CA passed Prop 218 in 1996- before that, City of LA could create/impose a lighting district at any time. This Prop took power away from government and gave it to the people. We are currently discussing the pedestrian lighting system on 11th St between Figueroa & Broadway. Blue sheet (<i>given in meeting</i>) has summary of Prop 218- in summary, assessment amount and therefore voting power is based on acreage and frontage. Only votes that are received are counted- abstaining doesn't count, and it's based on the financial obligation an owner would have from assessment. Have approx. 32 parcels that will be impacted.</p> <p>Yesterday (<i>June 19</i>)- ordinance of intention passed by City Council- on August 21st there will be a hearing with City Council. Property owners are given 45 days to vote, therefore ballots will be mailed on July 1st. Yesterday (<i>June 19</i>) letters were sent to property owners. Brought a sample ballot and assessment amount.</p>	
<p>Board and Public Comment on Item 4 – answers from speakers in italics</p>	<p>Gary- Is this just commercial? <i>NO, all assessed. So condos are only assessed if units are along 11th.</i></p> <p>Sauli- There was a previous assessment here? <i>YES- Evo was assessed before, and some of the assessment will need to be re-assessed on the ground floor. Lighting is considered to be a special benefit, and therefore is ALWAYS assessed to property owners.</i></p>	<p><i>No action taken</i></p> <p>BSL will research Grand Lofts participation based on R. Wu's question.</p>

	<p>Gary- There is existing lighting on this street- how does that impact this and rates or new, more efficient lighting? <i>YES, but BSL has not raised the rates since 1996, so even though energy savings from better lighting being put in, the other costs have gone up so it is offset or balanced. Plus, the cost of MAINTAINING these lights is more than old ones, which also offsets the energy differences. This project will improve lighting at intersections, as well as pedestrian level. Light levels will almost double on this street.</i></p> <p>Bob- Will current street lights stay? <i>YES, plus more on pedestrian and higher level.</i></p> <p>Shelby- Evo lighting assessment was established when? <i>In 2009. New lights around the perimeter are currently assessed from that ballot.</i></p> <p>Mercedes- From 1130 S Flower (Flower Street Lofts)- is in the boundary but not on the list. <i>Mercedes shows where it is- actually, she is not in the lighting district.</i></p> <p>Rob- Is this an annual assessment? Weighted? <i>YES, annual, and it's based on land use and acreage. So if there is a high rise, it will have more voting power as a whole.</i></p> <p>Richard- Is Evo voting? <i>NO, only the ground floor of that building.</i></p> <p>Richard- 1100 S Grand (Grand Lofts), are we part of this assessment, and only one owner is listed. <i>IF the county has 66 APNs all will be assessed. These are tied to property taxes, so it will be whoever received the property taxes. Richard would like to discuss at future date. Existing assessment is based on 1996 numbers with a different price scheme and methodology. You can calculate your own assessment on their website: bsl.lacity.org, click residents, Prop 218.</i></p> <p>Ruben- This assessment is just operation and maintenance. Property owners/residents are getting the physical lights for free.</p>	
--	---	--

	<p>Sauli- What about rest of the MyFig project? <i>The rest are not getting pedestrian lights, so they are not being assessed on Figueroa. A similar conversation to this will be had MLK owners.</i></p> <p>Gary- What happens if this vote does not pass? <i>THEN pedestrian lighting system will not be built. This is not part of the general fund, it is money specifically allotted through Federal grants for this development project. Property owners are already assessed for current lighting, this is increased lighting, thus a re-evaluation of lighting costs is being conducted- that is what you are voting on. End goal is to improve pedestrian safety and connectivity.</i></p> <p>Gary- But the new system is going to cost more than the old one, even with more efficient lights? <i>NO, because the adding of lights means city has to re-evaluate the entire area for lighting. The material costs to repair and replace- not construction, but maintaining it- offset the energy savings in new lights, i.e. labor rate for hours is greater than 20 years ago.</i></p> <p>Shelby- Is there a document that shows increase numbers specifically and the change in maintenance costs? <i>NO don't have it in a specific table.</i></p> <p>Shelby- Not the assessment but the actual costs to light the area.</p> <p>Rob- (Agreeing with Shelby) How did you determine this assessment, can we see the cost breakdown? <i>ITS not on a per-light basis, because it depends on the size of the street, it's based on what meets current lighting level.</i></p> <p>Gary- What is the math behind that assessment, and how does this make sense? How can they calculate overall cost if you don't know how much money it will cost to operate these lights? Do you think it would have been fair to credit that old assessment on new one? How to we get to that</p>	
--	--	--

	<p>number? It sounds like you're doing it based on size and scope and pedestrian lighting system. Is there an operation budget breakdown among the entire assessment of \$32,000- is there a breakdown? <i>Lacity.org/bsl – look up prop 218, there is a table on multiplying factors. BSL does not have a per-light formula for adding lights. Prop 218 is going into effect for 11th street because the increased lighting has triggered a re-evaluation of how much property owners are assessed. Everyone is already assessed for streetlights, and you may be assessed more because of the increase of safety and pedestrian lighting. The ballot that is coming out relates to whether or not you want this additional lighting system built.</i></p> <p>Ruben- There is no expectation for CBD to maintain this. Assessment will not be implemented until in operation. \$4 million on entire My Fig project construction in lighting. If not built, the money could go anywhere in the My Fig project- not necessarily 11th street. Would still like to see the entire budget for MyFig. FYI the lighting rates increases by no more than the CPI.</p>	
<p>Presentation: Sam Marshall, Hope Street Hotel (1130 Hope St)</p>	<p>Shannon- from Marshall Projects, the project architect for the proposed Hotel at 1130 Hope St. At the zoning hearing on May 15, a new boutique hotel at 10 stories with a pool deck on 9th floor was proposed. It is currently a 3-story abandoned building, having been empty since 1996. Design keeps 3 sides of the existing façade. There will be a total of 44 rooms in the hotel. Gave the presentation and responded to the comments at zoning hearing and gave letter with response to zoning. Final letter to zoning was June 13th.</p> <p>Design and Operation Specifics Include: Enter building through open courtyard, enter lobby with ground-floor restaurant. Penthouse suites above pool. High-end hotel, among the price point of the Ritz. Hotel has asked to operate 24 hours as a hotel, but with limits on lounge below, pool deck. Has aligned pool hours with surrounding residences except for Friday and Saturday. Detailed mitigation measures for noise will be</p>	<p><i>No action taken</i></p>

	integrated for the pool deck. It is mid-block.	
Public Comment on Item 6- answers from speakers in italics	<p>Sauli- Heard that this building might violate the Wiggins Act. <i>IT was a residential building in the past, but it was vacant before the Wiggins Act and CRA is assessing it right now.</i></p> <p>Jessica reads letter from Gerry, general manager of EVO- please see attached letter. Details the issues EVO is claiming against the hotel, including issues with setbacks necessary in the area. By keeping the façade of the brick building, it will continue to jut out 5 feet past LUMA.</p> <p>Richard- What was that building previously? <i>IT was an apartment complex, there is evidence that it was abandoned since 1996.</i></p> <p>Sara- Initially Councilmember Huizar had written a letter of support. He has since has received many letters from residents, and wants to take their concern into consideration and seriously. He sees the Hotel as taking the correct steps in mitigating.</p> <p>Melissa- Very concerned with lack of setbacks that the hotel is requested from Zoning Commission, as well as ingress and egress locations, which could create a huge loading distraction for the communities. EVO purchased a lot next to where EVO is, concerned about how EVO can develop their property in the future. EVO owns the space to the south where there is an easement. <i>Have looked at a traffic study that was accepted by the DOT, who is the official authority on these matters and provided a letter that approves the proposed ingress and egress. Trip count was low throughout the day and determined it would not significantly impact residents.</i></p> <p>Gary- This is legally non-conforming use because it has already constructed.</p> <p>Sauli- Owns 5 adjacent parcels, and is in support. There are going to be different setbacks as we are infilling the neighborhood as a whole.</p>	<i>No action taken</i>

	<p>Shelby- Where are you with the development process? <i>Looking into entitlements. Design phase is complete – ZA will have to accept the designs as they are or not.</i></p> <p>Gary- What is the next step with working with locals? <i>Hotel has met with HOAs and wrote a letter to Zoning Administrator Tovar explaining the mitigation measures they have taken.</i></p> <p>Victor- There is an increasing problem for loading linen and food as more hospitality-related businesses move in.</p> <p>Sarah- General SP issue about loading zones for commercial and passenger have been brought up to CD 14, and it is something they are dealing with city-wide. It is being considered and will hopefully be dealt with.</p>	
Review and approval of Bylaws	<p>Jessica - Incorporated all edits from Board members into bylaws, wanted to make changes to restrictions on election meetings.</p> <p>Questions pertaining to bylaws? Needed to explain very clearly roles and the necessities of Board membership, making the process transparent, but the bylaws hadn't given much flexibility in the past.</p>	Gary motions to approve the Bylaws, Phillip seconds, all in favor, none opposed.
Treasurer Report	<i>(Tabled for next month)</i>	<i>No action taken</i>
SOBO Report	<p>Bob- Met on Tues with BOE with respect to fix the sidewalks. What we learned is that it is complicated, but we can start to review the options and take steps towards hopefully fixing the ones in most need. Going to contact the property owners directly to get them to fix it- if not the owners can be cited. This (Chap 22) has not been used recently- whether the city will be willing to enforce is unclear. 4 major options for going about this- 1) voluntary, 2) Chap 22, 3) Prop 218, or 3) community petition. Other big issue is the trees that are breaking up with the sidewalks – which transfers the responsibility off the property owner and back to the City.</p> <p>Transition from Securitas to Streetplus has been going well. July 1 is the official transfer date,</p>	<i>No action taken</i>

	<p>although it will be in a process to complete all rebranding. No encampments this morning or for last two weeks under James Wood or 12th St. We are always happy to amend deployment based on calls we get in, but we can't change anything without residents input.</p> <p>Next SOBO meeting Wed July 3rd at 8:30 AM.</p>	
DISI	Jessica - New logo, working with conventions to get people visiting into restaurants. New business cards and letterhead coming.	<i>No action taken</i>
LUED	<i>(Tabled for next meeting)</i>	<i>No action taken</i>
Exec Director	<i>(Tabled for next meeting)</i>	<i>No action taken</i>
Director of Planning & Communications Report	<i>(Tabled for next meeting)</i>	<i>No action taken</i>
Other business	Database is moving forward.	<i>No action taken</i>
Next Meeting	Wed July 17 th at 8:30 AM	

Adjourned at 9:59 AM

Minutes taken by Amanda Irvine, staff, revised by Jessica Lall.